

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 9-22 and 25-73 are pending in the present application. Claims 9-22 and 25-73 presently stand rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 9-22 and 25-73 are in condition for allowance in view of the remarks presented herein, and their reconsideration for allowance is respectfully requested.

First Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed August 22, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 9-36 and 42-67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,889,989 to Robertazzi et al. (“Robertazzi”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,592,376 to Hodroff (“Hodroff”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,917,629 to Hortensius et al. (“Hortensius”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,535,408 to Hillis (“Hillis”). Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be withdrawn.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the reference(s) must teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1970). The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). One skilled in the art would not have been motivated to string together the disparate teachings of these four references to assemble the invention of independent claims 9 and 42.

For example, Hortensius discloses a “transceiver 16 that functions as an interface between the wired network 12 and the wireless network 13.” (Hortensius, col. 3, lines 9-11). However, and without acquiescence to the Examiner’s description of the other teachings of the prior art of record, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Robertazzi, Hodroff, Hortensius nor Hillis teach, disclose or suggest, alone or in combination, a system in which at least one of the personal computers includes a wireless network connection capable of coupling the personal computers to one or more of the other personal computers via the network. There is no suggestion to one skilled in the art to combine the disparate teachings of these four references in order to assemble the invention of independent claims 9 and 42.

Therefore, this rejection is not properly sustainable and Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the applicability of the Hillis reference to the claim 9 limitation “wherein the microchip provides active configuration of one or more circuits of the microchip, Applicant respectfully brings to the attention of the Examiner that this limitation was canceled in the Preliminary Amendment dated May 29, 2003, entry of which is respectfully requested to the extent not already of record.

Therefore, claims 9 and 42 are patentable over Robertazzi, Hodroff, Hortensius and Hillis, whether taken alone or in combination, as are claims 10-22, 25-41 and 43-73 which depend therefrom respectively, and which also recite additional important features therein. Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be withdrawn.

Second Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed August 22, 2003, the Examiner also rejected claims 37-41 and 68-72 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Robertazzi in view of Hodroff, Hortensius, Hillis, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,245,306 to Besemer (“Besemer”). Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be withdrawn.

At the outset, Applicant notes that claims 37-41 depend ultimately from independent claim 9, and claims 68-72 depend ultimately from independent claim 42. As discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Robertazzi, Hodroff, Hortensius nor Hillis teach, disclose or suggest, alone or in combination, a system in which at least one of the personal computers includes a wireless network connection capable of coupling the personal computers to one or more of the other personal computers via the network. Applicant respectfully submits that Besemer also does not teach, disclose or suggest this limitation of claims 9 and 42. In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the reference(s) must teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1970). Therefore, claims 37-41 and 68-72 are patentable over Robertazzi, Hodroff, Hortensius, Hillis and Besemer, whether taken alone or in combination.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Besemer does not teach, disclose or suggest “a firewall . . . configured to deny access to at least a first memory hardware component . . . by at least one of said other personal computers. . . further configured to allow access to at least a second memory hardware component . . . by at least one other of said other personal computers” as recited in claims 37 and 68.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 37 and 68, as well as their dependent claims, are patentable over Robertazzi, Hodroff, Hortensius, Hillis and Besemer, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be withdrawn.

Unless expressly stated otherwise herein, nothing contained in this amendment and response is to be construed as a narrowing amendment made for purposes related to patentability.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claims 9-22 and 25-73 are now believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed.

A Petition for Extension for Response within two months accompanies this reply. Authorization to the Commissioner to charge the fees for the extension for response to Applicant's attorney's deposit account is submitted herewith.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Pillsbury Winthrop LLP

By: 

Dale S. Lazar
Reg. No.: 28,872
Tel. No.: (703) 905-2126
Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

DSL/sm
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000